

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

HALO ELECTRONICS, INC., }  
Plaintiff, }  
vs. }  
PULSE ELECTRONICS, INC., *et al.*, }  
Defendants. }

On November 14, 2012, after Plaintiff Halo Electronics had completed presentation of its case in chief before the jury, Defendant Pulse Electronics, Inc. filed Defendants' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law of Non-Infringement, No Induced Infringement, and No Willfulness (Docs. #444 and #445). Pulse Supplemented its Motion (Doc. #455) on November 18, 2012. On November 19, 2012, Plaintiff Halo filed a written Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law Under Rule 50(a) (Doc. #458).

On November 20, 2012, Plaintiff Halo Electronics, Inc. also filed a Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law Under Rule 50(a) and Rule 52(c) (Doc. #461). Defendant Pulse filed a Response to Plaintiff Halo's Motion (Doc. #499) on December 4, 2012.

On November 26, 2012, the jury returned verdicts in favor of Plaintiff Halo and against Defendant Pulse on most of the infringement claims asserted, and

1 also found Defendant Pulse's infringement to be willful and awarded monetary  
2 damages.

3 The Court finds the evidence adduced at trial clearly supports the verdicts  
4 returned by the jury and therefore concludes that Defendant Pulse's Motions for  
5 Judgment as a Matter of Law (Doc. #444, #445, #455), must be denied.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff Halo's Counter Motion for  
8 Judgment as a Matter of Law (Doc. #461) is DENIED as moot in view of the  
9 verdicts of the jury.

10 DATED: March 11, 2013.

11   
12

13 PHILIP M. PRO  
United States District Judge

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26